

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly from November through April by the Department of Classical Languages at Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Subscription price: \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter at the Saint Louis, Missouri, Post-Office under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME 37

FEBRUARY 1961

NUMBER 4

Cicero and English Prose Style

An evil that has often been laid at the doorstep of learning Latin in the secondary school is the destruction of English style. Those who so object have a good point. Often the history of Johnny's high school writing career runs like this. Johnny Freshman: He stopped outside the door to get the mud off his shoes. Three years later Johnny Senior writes: He stopped outside the door in order that he might take the mud off his shoes. Not very encouraging to the English teacher, though it does prove to a reader that Johnny has been exposed to four years of high school Latin. The simple, forceful infinitive of purpose (found even in Latin not too long after Cicero) is displaced by the barbaric subjunctive-substitute and its clumsy introduction.

A solution to this difficulty is in an analysis of Latin prose style, an interesting educational experience in itself for the student. One should remember that Cicero did not have the resources of indentation, capital letters, and punctuation at hand for the modern writer. He had to devise some way of holding a unit of thought in place, without the typographical conditioning a modern author has unconsciously gone through. Cicero's great contribution to prose style was his device of developing an idea completely within one grammatical unit. It was not that the eye of the reader would see an indented block of print and expect to find a fully developed idea there; the reader Cicero had in mind would realize that completeness of thought was reached when completeness of grammar was realized. His paragraphs might be lost (if he had any concept of a paragraph) and his thought might sprawl if he could not keep it in check by the periodic sentence.¹

Latin Period and Modern Paragraph

A carefully executed paragraph from Adlai Stevenson's book, *What I Think*, will quickly

In this issue . . .

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Cicero and English Prose Style | William Shurr, S.J. 49 |
| Theologies of Epicurus and Lucretius | John E. Rexine 51 |
| Historical Causality in Polybius | |
| Language and American Progressiveness | Charles J. Beirne, S.J. 55, 57 |
| Editorial | 56 |
| Verse: Brief Bits from Martial | Ralph Marcellino 57 |
| Horace, Portrait Artist in Words | |
| (The Reverend) David J. Dooley 58 | |
| Breviora: Deaths among Classicists, II (p. 61). Meetings of Classical Interest, II (p. 62). Personalalia Quaedam, II (p. 62). Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies (J. P. Elder, p. 62). | |
| Book Review: Jean Smith and Arnold Toynbee, editors, Gilbert Murray, <i>An Unfinished Autobiography</i> (Sister M. Renelle Ojeman, S.S.N.D., p. 63). | |
| Materials Available through the Office of THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN | 64 |

illustrate the difference we have been speaking of.

With the unlocking of the Atom, mankind crossed one of the great watersheds of history. We have entered uncharted lands. The maps of strategy and diplomacy by which we guided ourselves until yesterday no longer reveal the way. Fusion and fission revolutionized the entire foundation of human affairs. It has placed mankind, in the words of Sir Winston Churchill, 'in a situation both measureless and laden with doom.'²

How would Cicero say the same thing? One who admires Cicero's style could almost automatically construct one of his periods containing the ideas found in these sentences. I believe that here, in the contrast between the Latin periodic sentence and the modern paragraph, we come to a basic understanding of Latin prose style. It is by overlooking this difference that the student will make his major mistake in translating and will encourage habits of incoherent writing.

A closer look at a periodic sentence used by Cicero reveals three main features: the use of many clauses, the use of subordination, and a separation of words (usually nouns and adjectives) that logically belong together. It is evident immediately that the third of these characteristics can rarely succeed in English. Our language does not have the rhyming word endings to keep the thought in place, to keep the right adjectives with their nouns, for instance. This is one reason why literal translation so often becomes gibberish, and if indulged in long enough

becomes habitual. In English the modifier, adverbial or adjectival, must be close to the modified.

English Phrases and Latin Clauses

Another example will best help illustrate the other two differences between Latin and English prose. Ernest Hemingway begins the fourth chapter of *The Green Hills of Africa* with the following sentences:

So in the morning, again, we started ahead of the porters and went down and across the hills through a deeply forested valley and then up and across a long rise of country with high grass that made the walking difficult and on and up and across, resting sometimes in the shade of a tree, and then on and up and down and across, all in high grass, now, that you had to break a trail in, and the sun was very hot. The five of us in single file, Droop and M'Cola with a big gun apiece, hung with musettes and water bottles and the cameras, we all sweating in the sun, Pop and I with guns and the Memsahib trying to walk like Droopy, her Stetson tilted on one side, happy to be on a trip, pleased about how comfortable her boots were, we came finally to a thicket of thorn, trees over a ravine that ran down from the side of a ridge to the water and we leaned the guns against the trees and went under the close shade and lay on the ground.³

The style here is self-conscious; still, since Cicero too is self-conscious at times, the example may bring out some basic differences. A quick look at Hemingway's paragraph shows phrases, both prepositional and participial, used where we would find clauses in Latin. Notice also the linking of phrases with phrases; there is coordination here where we would expect to find subordination in Latin. Cicero's technique of sandwiching clauses within clauses becomes, in English, the technique of linking phrases to the sentence.

A less extreme example of modern prose style reveals the same technique. It is taken from William Faulkner's speech when he accepted the Nobel prize for literature. Notice again the use of phrases for clauses and the technique of linking rather than sandwiching.

Our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it. There are no longer problems of spirit. There is only the question: when will I be blown up? Because of this the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good writing because only that is worth writing about, worth the agony and the sweat.⁴

The practical pedagogical conclusions suggested by this rather theoretical discussion of styles are perhaps obvious. The first one would be that the periodic sentence must be translated

into an English paragraph, with topic sentence taken from the central thought of the Latin sentence. Clarity of expression is certainly one of the major goals of secondary education, and one very good exercise for achieving this is a careful analysis of a completely developed idea in the Latin periodic sentence, and a translation of it into the medium dictated by centuries of paragraphing thought in English.

The second practical conclusion is closely connected with this and involves more detailed work on style within the paragraph: phrases frequently displace clauses, and coordination takes the place of subordination.

The ear of a writer is one of his most important assets. The student must listen, as well as look, for the different phrasings and different rhythms in Latin and English. It is only by some such analysis of style that Latin can be made to help English expression. Otherwise it will hinder, and Johnny will keep his "in order that's" long after graduation.

William Shurr, S.J.

Saint Xavier High School,
Cincinnati, Ohio

NOTES

1 I am speaking mainly of the reader of Cicero's prose, not of those who listened to him. Even in his speeches Cicero had an eye to publication; and, practically speaking, they reach the modern student through the eye rather than through the ear. 2 Quoted in *Modern Essays*, edited by Russel Nye (Chicago 1957) 453. 3 Ernest Hemingway, *The Green Hills of Africa* (New York 1935) 46-47. 4 William Faulkner, "Acceptance of the Nobel Prize." In *The World's Great Speeches*, edited by Lewis Copeland and Lawrence Lamm (New York 1958) 637.

The manner in which Cicero conducted a defence when the cause was not so grave or so desperate is well illustrated by . . . the *Pro Archia*. The case here was one of contested citizenship. . . . But the speech Cicero delivered is one of the permanent glories of Latin literature. The matter immediately at issue is summarily dealt with in a few pages of cursory and rather careless argument; then the scholar lets himself go. Among the many praises of literature which great men of letters have delivered, there is hardly one more perfect than this.—J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*.

Theologies of Epicurus and Lucretius

In the *Vita Epicuri*, which is in fact the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius' history of the philosophers, there is extant a body of confused, disjointed, and disconnected but valuable factual material. This work contains a large number of quotations from Epicurus' writings which are quite similar in their language to that employed in the *Epistulae*. However informative and interesting this *Vita Epicuri* might be in general, specifically with regard to theology and religion, it reveals something of Epicurus which I think distinguishes him from Lucretius, and that is a difference of attitude toward religion. In the *Vita*,¹ Epicurus is spoken of with great deference. He is described as being a very benevolent person—to parents, brothers, servants. "In short there is his *benevolence* to all" (*καθόλου τε ἡ πρὸς πάντας αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπία*). That is one of his two most apparent characteristics; his other is his profound reverence (*δοσιότηης*). "Of his reverence toward the gods and his love of his country it would be impossible to speak adequately" (*τῆς μὲν πρὸς θεοὺς δοσιότητος καὶ πρὸς πατρίδα φιλίας ἄλεκτος ἡ διάθεσις*).

This is quite a different view from what one would get by reading the charges hurled by Cicero and Plutarch against the Epicureans—that they were actually atheists. This charge was sanctioned by tradition throughout the Middle Ages.² Yet the charge would appear formally untenable, however untoward popular opinion of Epicureanism may be. However, I do not think that Lucretius was as mild about the traditional theology and religion as one might mistakenly believe from reading the works of Cyril Bailey. Bailey has a tendency, every now and then, to apologize for Lucretius and Epicurus when it comes to their views on theological matters by saying that they substituted something finer. In speaking of the Epicurean view of religion, Bailey says: "It is a fine and really living conception and it is certainly very far removed from the abnegation of religion."³ This is surely true of Epicurus' attitude toward religion, which is a pious one. It seems to carry through his works. Epicurus does not "attack" religion; Lucretius cries violently against it.

Two factors are fundamental in both Epicurus and Lucretius: (1) the gods; (2) the fear of death. Both these factors are somewhat intimately connected. In the letter *Ad Herodotum* (81), Epicurus says that the . . . "principal disturbance (*τάραχος ὁ κυριώτατος*) in the minds of men arises because they think that these celestial bodies are blessed and immortal," and also "because they are always expecting or imagining some everlasting misery, such as is depicted in legends, or even the loss of feeling in death, as though it would concern them themselves."⁴ It is the agents of these "divine creatures" who seek to terrify people with stories of Acheron and its punishments.⁵

Common Factors in Both Writers

Both writers are therefore professing to put forth explanations of natural science to relieve man of these two fundamental fears. Basic to both, but clearly put forth in Epicurus, is the principle of peace of mind (*ἀταραξία*).⁶ The only reason for studying natural science is to gain knowledge of the phenomena of the heavens and thus bring to man "peace of mind." In *Fragmentum* 5, *Ethica* 80, we have this succinct statement about "peace of mind": "The greatest fruit of justice is serenity" (*Δικαιοσύνης καρπὸς μέγιστος ἀταραξία*). Thus we have the justification for modifying the traditional theology and the gods who wrought nothing but fear. But Epicurus, at least, remains pious and not violent. I repeat what seems to me the fundamental difference in *attitude* between Epicurus and Lucretius: Epicurus is respectful and pious; Lucretius violently anti-theological. Very interesting with regard to Epicurus are the following fragments:⁷ (57) "Let us at least sacrifice *piously* and *rightly* where it is customary and let us do all things rightly according to the laws, not troubling ourselves with the common beliefs in what concerns the noblest and holiest of beings. Further let us be free of any charge in regard to their opinion. For thus can one live in conformity with nature." (58) "If God listened to the prayers of men, all men would quickly have perished; for they are forever praying for evil against one another."

I have emphasized Epicurus' piety, and yet everybody knows that he attacked the tradi-

tional religion and theology on the ground that the gods have no part in the government of the world. To illustrate his views on the gods, I quote at length first from the *Epistula ad Menoeceum* (3.123-124):

First of all believe that god is a being immortal and blessed, even as the common idea of a god is engraved on men's minds and do not assign to him anything alien to his immortality or ill-suited to his blessedness; but believe about him everything that can uphold his blessedness and immortality. *For gods there are, since knowledge of them is by clear vision <ἐναργῆς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἔστιν ἡ γνῶσις>.* But they are not such as the many believe them to be; for indeed they do not consistently represent them as they believe them to be. And the impious man is not he who denies the gods of the many, but he who attaches to the gods the beliefs of the many. For the statements of the many about the gods are not conceptions derived from sensation but false suppositions, according to which the greatest misfortunes befall the wicked and the greatest blessings <the good> by the gift of the gods. For men being accustomed always to their own virtues welcome those like themselves, but regard all that is not of their nature as alien.⁸

Notice how careful Epicurus is not to be charged with impiety. The *ἀταραξία* of the gods is what each man should piously seek. Thus "the contemplation with placid mind of the perfect peace of the gods becomes in this way a 'blessing' to the worshipper, for it enables him to assimilate himself more closely to them and to allow the images which tell him of their form to bring with them into his mind something of the tranquillity which they represent."⁹

Nature of Epicurean Gods

To proceed further, of what nature are these Epicurean gods if they do not take any part in the governing of the world and human affairs? The fourth of the *Κύρια Δόξαι* tells us: "The blessed and immortal nature knows no trouble to any other, so that it is never constrained by anger or favour. For all such things exist only in the weak." The only other information on the gods we have from Epicurus himself is from the following excerpts from the *Epistula ad Herodotum*¹⁰ and the *Epistula ad Menoeceum*:¹¹

(77) Furthermore, the motions of the heavenly bodies and their turnings and eclipses and risings and settings and kindred phenomena to these, must not be thought to be due to any being who controls and ordains or has ordained them and at the same time enjoys perfect bliss together with immortality (for trouble and care and anger and kindness are not consistent with a life of blessedness, but these things come to pass where there is weakness and fear and dependence on neighbours). Nor again must we believe that they, which are but fire agglomerated in a mass, possess blessedness and voluntarily take upon themselves these movements. But we must preserve their full majestic

significance in all expressions which we apply to such conceptions in order that there may not arise out of them opinions contrary to this notion of majesty.

(133) For indeed who, think you, is a better man than he who holds reverent opinions concerning the gods, and is at all times free from fear of death, and has reasoned out the end ordained by nature? (134) For indeed, it were better to follow the myths about the gods than become a slave to the destiny of the natural philosophers: for the former suggests a hope of placating the gods by worship, whereas the latter involves a necessity which knows no placation. As to chance, he regards it as a god as most men do (for a god's acts there is no disorder). . . .

From here on our normal sources fail and secondary sources have to be used. On the authority of Cicero in the *De Natura Deorum*, the Epicureans argued that the gods exist because of the universal belief in them, "which has been implanted by nature in the minds of all men." This, I take it, is the famous Lucretian *notities* or preconception which is recalled in Book 5 of the *De Rerum Natura* (1161-1168). Epicurus gives the real reason: "gods there are, since the knowledge of them is by clear vision." From this point on it is Lucretius who clarifies the nature of the gods and their function.

Divergent Attitude of Lucretius

I have emphasized the difference in theological attitudes in Epicurus and Lucretius. I feel that such an evident distinction actually exists. The references to the gods and religion are scattered throughout the *De Rerum Natura*.¹² In the very first book, Lucretius is anxious to hurl a biting attack against religion. The Iphigenia at Aulis passage is significant in its position and its bitterness. How biting indeed is the last line of this passage, after the description of the human sacrifice of Iphigenia: *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum*. Even before this (44-49), we get a hint of the nature of the gods in which Lucretius says: "for it must needs be that all the nature of the gods enjoys life everlasting in perfect peace, sundered and separated far away from our world. For free from all grief, free from danger, mighty in its own resources, never lacking aught of us, it is not won by virtuous service nor touched by wrath."¹³ The rest of Book 1 is silent on theology.

In Book 2 (167-183) Lucretius warns Memmius against believing a certain sect that holds that natural phenomena are due to the gods. In lines 646-651 of the same book we find a repeti-

tion of the nature of the gods given first in lines 44-49 of Book 1. And finally, in Book 2, lines 1090-1104, we are told that nature does all things without the help of the gods. The placid life of the gods is again related and emphasized, and the question is sarcastically asked: "Who can avail to rule the whole sum of the boundless, who to hold in his guiding hand the mighty reins of the deep, who to turn round all the firmaments at once, and warm the fruitful lands with heavenly fires, or to be at all times present in all places, so as to make darkness with clouds, and shake the calm tracts of heaven with thunder, and then shoot thunderbolts, and often make havoc of his own temples, or moving away into deserts rage furiously there, plying the bolt, which often passes by the guilty and does death to the innocent and undeserving?"

In Book 3, we have one delightful six-line passage on the gods (18-24): "The majesty of the gods is revealed, and their peaceful abodes, which neither the winds shake nor clouds soak with showers, nor does the snow congealed with biting frost besmirk them with its white fall, but an ever cloudless sky vaults them over, and smiles with light bounteously spread abroad. Moreover, nature supplies all they need, nor does anything gnaw at their *peace of mind* at any time." Lucretius here paints a very lovely poetic picture but in the next few lines bursts out again claiming that there is no such place as Acheron.

A Momentous Passage

Book 4 is void of any reference to the gods, and so it is not until Book 5 that we meet the gods again. Lines 82-90 of Book 5 remind us of the carefree life of the gods. In lines 146-155, we are told something about the composition of the gods. Of course they are atomic. They are unlike human beings both in their abodes and in the subtlety (*tenues de corpore eorum*) of their bodies. Apparently they, as well as their abodes, are composed of very fine atoms. In line 155 Lucretius says: *quae tibi posterius largo sermone probabo*, and never does so.

In the same book (1161-1192) we have perhaps the most complete statement about the gods to be found either in Epicurus or in Lucre-

tius. These lines are so important and revealing that I shall quote them in full:

Next, what cause spread abroad the divine powers of the gods among great nations, and filled cities with altars, and taught men to undertake sacred rites at yearly festivals, rites which are honoured today in great empires and at great places; whence even now there is implanted in mortals a shuddering dread *<insitus horror>* which raises new shrines of the gods over all the world, and constrains men to throng to them on holy days; of all this it is not hard to give account in words. For indeed already the race of mortals *used to perceive* the glorious shapes of the gods with waking mind, and all the more in sleep with wondrous bulk of body. To these then they would assign sense because they were seen to move their limbs, and to utter haughty sounds befitting their noble mien and ample strength. And they gave them *everlasting life because their images came in constant stream and the form remained unchanged*, and indeed above all because they thought that those endowed by such strength could not readily be vanquished by force. They thought they far excelled in happiness because the fear of death never harassed any of them, and at the same time because in sleep they saw them accomplish many marvels, yet themselves not undergo any toil therefrom. Moreover, they beheld the workings of the sky in due order, and the diverse seasons of the year come round, nor could they learn by what causes that was brought about. And so they made it their refuge to lay all to the charge of the gods, and to suppose that all was guided by their will. And they placed the abodes and quarters of the gods in the sky, because through the sky night and the moon are seen to roll on their way, moon, day, and night, and the stern signs of night, and the torches of heaven that rove through the night, and the flying flames, clouds, sunlight, rain, snow, winds, lightning, hail, and the rapid roar and mighty murmurings of heaven's threats.

In Book 6 (68-78), we are again warned not to pollute our minds with thoughts unworthy of the gods. In lines 379-422, we have a long passage on Jupiter and the gods, and the thunderbolt, which is in effect quite ironic: "Why rather is one conscious of no foul guilt wrapt and entangled, all innocent, in the flames . . . ? Why again do they aim at the waste places . . . ? Why does he *<Jupiter>* smite asunder the sacred shrines of the gods and his own glorious dwelling-places with hostile bolt? Why does he destroy the fair-fashioned idols of the gods and take away their beauty from his images with his furious wound?"

This, therefore, completes what Lucretius has to say about the gods. Lucretius, to be sure, believes in the existence of the gods. This is manifest from the sources quoted above. There are two reasons given for believing in the existence of the gods: one, he says, "false"; the other, "true." The "false" reason is under the heading of "celestial phenomena." That is to say, Lucretius maintains that when human be-

ings look upon the orderly course and pattern of heavenly bodies, they suppose wrongly that this can be brought about only by divine providence. They look upon celestial phenomena such as lightning, storm, and thunder, and attribute these also to divine ordinance. However, the "true" reason for belief in the actual existence of the immortals comes through the visions of the gods with which we are blessed. These visions that we have of the gods are described in lines 1161-1192 of Book 5 (quoted above). These visions attest to the wondrous size, beauty, movement, continuity, immortality, and sensation of the gods. These visions are in fact caused by the *simulacra* which are so *tenuia* that they cannot be comprehended by the senses but are held to be recognized by a nebulous thing known as an "act of attention on the part of the mind" (*ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*). The best plausible explanation of this whole business seems to be that the gods have an identity of form and not an identity of body. Just as a waterfall keeps shedding its watery "film" but retains its form, so the gods keep sending off *simulacra*, but these are constantly being replaced. These blessed creatures dwell in the interspaces (*intermundia*) of the universe in a perfectly deathless tranquillity.

Lucretius' violent attitude can be seen quite readily in his theological views. It is false religion (or superstition) which comes down from heaven and oppresses human life and commits impious deeds (the sacrifice of Iphigenia). It propagates stories about Acheron and its dire punishments after death. The gods could not possibly have made the world, for it is made badly.¹⁴ The tenets and beliefs of false religion must be strongly and if needs be violently opposed and banished by the stronger power of scientific inquiry; the gods are not responsible for celestial activity and phenomena. The gods are not responsible for the governing of the world, nor are they interested in human affairs.

Thus, we have Lucretius and Epicurus striving for the same end but with different tones. Epicurus does not impress one as violent. He is calm. He perhaps tried to taste the *ἀταραξία* with which he was so much striving to influence people. Lucretius knows that the "true piety is to be able to regard all things with a tranquil

mind,"¹⁵ and that calm tranquillity is an ideal which is expressed in the gods who are themselves a realization of this moral ideal. The imitation of their life of *ἀταραξία* is a form of worship. But Lucretius bursts out, every now and then, and at the oddest places, against the common views on the gods and the universe, which instead of producing "peace of mind" produce disturbance of mind.

John E. Rexine

Colgate University

NOTES

1 Cyril Bailey, *Epicurus* (Oxford 1926) 147 (*Vita Epicuri* 10); cited hereafter as *Epicurus*. 2 Cyril Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus* (Oxford 1928) 438; cited hereafter as *Atomists*. 3 *Atomists*, 481. 4 *Epicurus*, 53. 5 *Lucr.* 1.102-109. 6 *Cf. Ep. ad Pythoclem* 85. 7 *Physica, frag. D* (*Epicurus*, 155). 8 *Epicurus*, 84-88. 9 *Atomists*, 480. 10 *Epicurus*, 49. 11 *Epicurus*, 91. 12 References to the gods: 1.44-49; 2.167-188, 646-651, 1090-1104; 3.18-24; 5.82-90, 146-155, 1161-1192; 6.68-78, 379-422. 13 *Cf. Κύριος Δόξαι* 1. 14 *Lucr.* 5.1203. 15 *Lucr.* 2.167-181; 5.156-234. The English translations used in this paper are those of Cyril Bailey.

Eta Sigma Phi Medals

may be purchased by any high school Latin teacher who certifies that these will be given only to students who have made an average of 90+ during the year.

The medals have been used for more than 25 years by teachers to reward outstanding students and encourage study of Latin.

The following medals are available:

Medal No. 1—Fourth Year Latin Award
(Silver, 1½") \$3.75

Medal No. 2—Alternate Fourth Year Award
(Silver, ¾") \$1.25

Medal No. 3—Second Year Latin Award
(Bronze, ¾") \$1.25

Orders should be placed at least three weeks before medals are desired, with:

Prof. H. R. Butts, Executive Secretary
Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham 4, Alabama

Historical Causality in Polybius

Polybius, like Herodotus, prepared himself for his work as an historian by traveling. He was one of the Achaean statesmen sent as hostages to Rome after the fall of Perseus of Macedonia in 168 B.C.; and he turned his enforced exile to advantage in his position as teacher and friend of Scipio Aemilianus. In 152 B.C. Polybius accompanied Scipio to Spain, when the latter served as legate to the consul Lucullus. As companion of Scipio in 146 B.C. he witnessed the fall of Carthage. Shortly afterwards, exploring the African coast, he proceeded along the Mediterranean. Continuing up the Portuguese coast, Polybius completed his travels before he returned to Greece. Classical authorities differ in their attempts to assign a date to Polybius' journey over the Alps; but in any case all agree that his account of Hannibal's march is a primary source for that campaign. Before his death, at the age of eighty-two, Polybius had visited almost all of Greece and Italy and had toured Egypt, Sicily, and the Iberian peninsula.

Causality as Paramount in Polybius

The most important contribution made to historiography by Polybius is his study of historical causality. In his third book he maintains that: "by far the most essential part of history is the consideration of the consequences of events, concomitant circumstances, and above all their causes (3.32.6)."¹

The third book thoroughly explores causality almost to the point of presenting so many details that the essential aims tend to be obscured. Three distinctions are made in the analysis of causes: *αἰτία* (events leading an individual to conceive a will to war), *πρόφασις* (the reason given for the war, whether or not this reason is genuine), and finally the *ἀρχή* (the first action of the war, whether or not fought by the person who conceived it) (3.6.7-14).² These technicalities are superseded in the study of causality by an analysis of *Tyche's* role in the destiny of man and research on the *Constitution of Rome*.

The Greek word *τυχή* according to Walbank is used fifty-one times in the first three books of the *Historiae*, which indicates the flexibility of meaning assigned to it.³ At times the name

signifies the Greek goddess of chance, *Tyche*, who is constantly changing the fortunes of men in unexpected directions. Even this role of *Tyche* is changed at times from the fickle goddess to the instrument of justice, when circumstances call for the retributive function of the goddess. Most frequently, however, the word is used to describe "luck" or "good fortune" in somewhat the same manner as we would employ the words today.

We can easily get the impression after a cursory reading of the *Historiae*, that Polybius considers the goddess of chance to be the sole and efficient cause of the greatness of Rome. Are we to believe from the following excerpt that the Romans were involuntarily thrust into the limelight of history through the power of the ever-changing goddess? He says that dominion over the whole world by the Romans "is the finest and most beneficent of the performances of Fortune . . . she has not in a single instance ever accomplished such a triumph, as in our own time" (1.4.4).

Polybius qualifies the previous statement with the following: "In the case of a thing of which it is difficult or impossible for mortal men to grasp the causes, one might justifiably refer them, in one's difficulty, to *Tyche* (36.17.1)."⁴

Tyche's role presents an even greater problem in the excerpt which follows and appears to be diametrically opposed to the section from the first book:

. . . the progress of the Romans was not due to chance and was not involuntary, as some of the Greeks choose to think, but that by schooling themselves in such vast and perilous enterprises it was perfectly natural that they not only gained the courage to aim at universal dominion, but executed their purpose (1.63.9).

Attempted Reconciliations of Conflicts

Apparently, *Tyche* is given complete credit for the remarkable accomplishments of the Romans in such a short time, and then in the same book this seems to be contradicted. What is the solution to this difficulty? Von Scala, who did extensive work on the *Historiae* at the end of the nineteenth century, offered the opinion that there was a basic change in the theories of Polybius. Bury shares this opinion with Von Scala and others when they attribute this change of outlook to certain qualified Stoical

(Concluded on page 57)

The Classical Bulletin

Published by the Department of Classical Languages
at Saint Louis University

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

William Charles Korfmacher.....	Editor
Chauncey Edgar Finch.....	Associate Editor
Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Claude Herman Heithaus, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Lawrence Frederick Jansen, S.J.....	Associate Editor

Address: 221 North Grand Boulevard, Saint Louis 3, Missouri
Subscription: \$2.00 per year. Single copies: 40c. To members of the ACL, CAAS, CAMWS, CANE, and CAPS, \$1.60 per year through the Office of the Secretary-Treasurer of each of these organizations.

Concerning subscriptions, renewals, books, pamphlets, advertising, and the like, please address the Editor. Concerning manuscripts for possible publication, address any member of the Committee.

Volume 37 February 1961 Number 4

Language and American Progressiveness

Mr. Brooks Atkinson, writing on "Language Suited to a Nation's Purpose" in *The New York Times* (and reproduced in the Sunday edition of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* of January 29, 1961), views with admiration President John F. Kennedy's fifteen hundred word inaugural address. "By using words with candor, courage and clarity," he says, "President Kennedy has quickened the life of the nation."

More sweeping, however, is Mr. Atkinson's statement that "a good cause could be made that the most progressive periods in American life have coincided with Presidents who wrote and spoke with a fresh command of the language. Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt kept the national spirit alive by finding trenchant words and word combinations. They turned phrases that have become part of the national idiom. For versatility in the use of words is not a social grace. It is creative." Readers searching for political partisanship in the quotation, by the way, will be reassured by the happy citing of two Republican Presidents against two Democrats.

Be that as it may, classicists have long believed that there is an intimate connection between clarity and cogency of expression and clarity and cogency of thinking. When, in 1924, the Report of *The Classical Investigation* appeared, the third of the announced "disciplinary

objectives" in the study of Latin was stated as: "the development of correct habits of reflective thinking applicable to the mastery of other subjects of study and to the solution of analogous problems in daily life." Classicists then believed that the language of a man who spoke clearly and effectively reflected, and reacted upon, a mind that reasoned and judged clearly and effectively; and that it was a duty of Latin teachers to exploit such reflection and reaction, not alone in Latin itself, but in English, and in the student's thought life generally.

Mr. Atkinson believes that the "national purpose" can be "lost in slovenly syntax," and he implies that such syntactical lassitude was not a defect of the Founding Fathers, nor, he indicates, is it a fault of Mr. Kennedy.

Classicists, remembering the anxious concern of Greek and Latin writers over the vehicle of expression, and recalling the long tradition of both Greek and Roman writers on rhetoric and the art of effective speech, will readily agree that correct and forceful language bespeaks a correct and forceful mind—even though they will understand that rhetoric is a two-edged tool, capable of promoting the cause of error and deceit as well as the cause of truth. They will remind themselves, too, that the latent possibilities of Latin and Greek language study for stirring mental improvement and reacting upon habits of reasoning and judging may well remain latent unless teachers of the two languages themselves actuate the disciplinary objective in question.

Rhetorical and stylistic analysis, even in lower level classes, is one obvious need. Mr. Atkinson is charmed by the fourteen words in which George Washington said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair," and by the twenty-five in which Mr. Kennedy defined his national objective: "not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved." Classicists need likewise to emphasize the forcefulness of language by which a Demosthenes roused a none too responsive Athenian populace to the dangers of Macedonian imperialism and a Cicero incited a somewhat lethargic senate against a Catilinarian conspiracy.

—W. C. K.

Brief Bits from Martial

Some thirty poems in this book
Are poor, you say. Egad!
If you've found thirty good ones, too,
The book is great, not bad (7.81).

The distich writer seeks to please
By being brief and quick.
But what's the use of brevity
In a book three inches thick? (8.29)

The public likes my poems, though
A certain critic thinks them rough
Or never polished quite enough.

I could not care less! I prefer
The morsels served up in my books
To please my guests, not would-be cooks (9.81).

Cynthia, the lyric theme
Of young Propertius' eloquence,
Gained immortality from him,
And gave him a name no less immense
(14.189).
Ralph Marcellino

West Hempstead High School,
New York

Polybius

(Concluded from page 55)

influences from Panaetius who, although a Stoic in his teaching, nevertheless did not adopt the view that the world is governed by laws of iron necessity which exclude free will.⁵

The most recent commentator on Polybius, F. W. Walbank, disagrees completely with the conclusions of previous scholars.⁶ He reconciles the apparent contradiction by stating that Polybius himself did not have a completely clear notion of the exact role of Tyche in history. Yet he believed that Tyche aided the Romans to accomplish what was already intended for them. The seeds of greatness were in the Romans themselves from the beginning, and beneficent Tyche helped them to attain this goal sooner than would have otherwise been possible.

Walbank's view appears to be better founded. It would appear illogical that an historian of the calibre of Polybius would have allowed such

a contradiction to stand, especially since the two statements occur within a short space of each other. The excerpt, quoted above from Book 36, would seem to bear out this opinion. Here Polybius limits the role of Tyche to those events which are a mystery.

One further related aspect of Polybius has always aroused the interest of the modern historian, his cyclic theory of history. According to Polybius, there are three types of constitutional government which the world has witnessed since the dawn of history: monarchical, aristocratic, and democratic (6.3.5). Polybius took into consideration the numerous discussions on the relative merits of these three forms.

The process named *ἀνακύκλωσις* is also operating on forms of government gradually leading to their destruction. Every nation has its *origin*, followed by *growth*, which reaches maturity in the *acme*, and then gives way to its *decline* (6.9.12-13). This obviously presented a difficulty to the mind of Polybius when he was writing the history of the Roman Empire, a second fatherland to him. He saw Rome at its *acme* and probed for an answer to the inevitable climax which would mark the end.

A mixed constitution, says Polybius, would seem to be the answer to this problem:

... What chiefly attracts and benefits students of history is just this—the study of causes and the consequent power of choosing what is best in each case. Now the chief cause of success or failure in all matters is the form of a state's constitution; for springing from this as from a fountain-head, all designs and plans of action not only originate, but reach their consummation (6.2.8-10).

This constitution would be composed of the best parts taken from the three forms of government: monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. These qualities were embodied in the Roman constitution; and as long as the Roman people complied with the provisions stated in the mixed constitution they could look forward to the perpetuity of their great nation.

Bellarmino College, Charles J. Beirne, S.J.
Plattsburgh, New York

NOTES

- 1 Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. F. W. Walbank, *Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford 1957) 360.
- 2 Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. Paton (London 1922).
- 3 Walbank, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 1) 14.
- 4 Ibid. 17.
- 5 *Ancient Greek Historians* (London 1909) 202.
- 6 Walbank, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 1) 129.

Horace, Portrait Artist in Words

If, as the evidence seems to show,¹ the *Saturae* and *Epistulae* of Horace enjoyed a greater reputation and were more often quoted in the Middle Ages than were his *Carmina* and *Epodi*, the reason undoubtedly lay in the greater preoccupation of those times with moralizing and their fondness for such literature as more professedly instructed men in the right way of living. Though the *Saturae* and *Epistulae* can be studied and appreciated from a purely literary point of view, more attention was paid to their content than to their form and to the techniques whereby the content was put across to the reader. It is not, of course, hard to concede the superiority of content to form, if choose one must. But fortunately, one may in this instance have his cake and eat it, too, and having assimilated the content, find it now not unprofitable to study the form, the technique, and other accidentals of the literary work for its greater appreciation.

And so it is with no thought of claiming that Horace deliberately set out to make of himself a portrait artist in words that we confidently assert that, in his own small scale, Horace does actually present us with a number of unforgettable miniatures in his writings. Sometimes we have only a few sentences, and the picture is completed. At other times, as in the case of the descriptions of himself and his own preferences and dislikes, the picture will be seen to emerge gradually from a reading of all his works or at least some major portion of them. Confining ourselves to the two books of *Saturae*, let us see what some of his famous portraits are and how he went about their painting.

"The Boor"

Undoubtedly one of the best known of the satires is the ninth of Book 1. Entitled "The Boor" by popular consensus, it presents us with a situation with which we are all only too familiar. The details of our own meeting with our own particular boor may be quite different, but *Via Sacra* or cocktail party, our experience has been essentially the same, and we find ourselves not merely chuckling at Horace's predicament in a detached sort of way, but also saying

to ourselves, "That reminds me of the time that I . . ."

This ninth satire opens with a skillfully depicted two-line setting. There was nothing unusual in Horace's taking a walk on the *Via Sacra* (*sicut meus est mos*, 1.9.1); there was no particular reason why he was there this day (*ibam forte*, *ibid.*); there was nothing of any importance on his mind: just a thought or so about—well, about who knows what (*nescio quid meditans nugarum*, 1.9.2). Into this quiet scene bounds a man Horace barely knows (*accurrit . . . notus mihi nomine tantum*, 1.9.3). The first interchange is then noted in which the boor shows himself as effusive (*dulcissime rerum*, 1.9.4) and bragging (*docti sumus*, 1.9.7); Horace is restrained and polite.

Horace badly wants to be rid of the fellow who is not only importunate, but who knows it and does not care. Only let Horace become aware of his accomplishments, he says, and he will value him more highly than he does Viscus and Varius. Why is this so? We can almost see Horace's own delight as now, some time after the event, he recounts the reasons advanced by the boor. The fellow boasts that he can write much and with proper haste; he can dance; he is an accomplished singer. All the wrong reasons! With long and serious thought the boor could hardly have chosen three reasons better calculated to "lose friends and alienate people," as far as Horace was concerned.

Yet wait! We should not underrate the man's offensiveness. His ace-in-reverse is his attempt to gain entry into Maecenas' circle of friends through Horace. We know from other places (*Sat.* 2.6.50-58) how much Horace resented being thought of as one who knows everything through Maecenas and who was that great man's adviser in matters large and small. When Horace deliberately gives him false encouragement, the boor enthusiastically explains how he will pursue Maecenas and hound him until he has achieved his friendship, and, of course, once again he chooses the most inappropriate means to his end that he could possibly find. *Muneribus servos corrumpam, occurram in triviis* (*Sat.* 1.9.57, 59).

A short episode follows in which one of Horace's friends maliciously refuses to help him

out, and the plaintiff whom the boor had ignored catches up with him. The satire comes to a rapid end. *Rapit in ius. Clamor utrimque, undique concursus* (Sat. 1.9.77-78).

Who once having read such a delightful story does not carry away with himself not only the tale but vivid pictures of the now impatient, now resigned Horace, of the wickedly teasing, non-cooperative friend, Fuscus Aristius, and especially of the gushing, insensitive, unpleasant fellow from whom only the divine intervention of Apollo could save Horace?

It will be noticed that this satire leans heavily on dialogue to make its effect, and it is in form the most dramatic of all the satires.

Dialogue and Description

In the seventh satire of Book 1 we again have some vivid pictures, but now Horace's manner of representation has been varied a bit. It is no longer characterization solely through dialogue, but a greater element of description by the author has entered. Thus in the first two lines Horace's own opinions about his characters leave us in no doubt as to the type of people with whom we are here concerned. Rupilius Rex is full of foul venom (*pus atque venenum*), while Persius is a mongrel (*hybrida*), a bold and blustering man, of bitter speech to boot (*confidens, tumidus, sermonis amari*) (Sat. 1.7.1, 2, 7).

These two lovely characters are locked in a struggle before the law, and the case is being heard before the praetor Brutus. Persius is evidently a man of some wit and eloquence (*salso multoque fluenti*, Sat. 1.7.28), for he draws the laughs of the assembly, and before he has presented his claims has both flattered Brutus and his whole staff and in the same breath taken a verbal poke at Rex. In answer to this, Rex lets loose with some choice language of his own such as can be heard coming from any vineyard, says Horace, when the vine-dresser retorts to those who twit him on his late pruning.

While Rex is thus engaged, Persius has had a few more nips of a cheap Italian wine he has been drinking, and now his wit breaks forth anew as he makes the pun which is the point

of the story and Horace's stopping place. It was two men with the name of Brutus who had driven the Tarquins out of Rome and who centuries later killed Julius Caesar. The praetor is also named Brutus. Let him, says Persius, continue the tradition and behead this new Rex.

Such is the delightful little slice-of-life that Horace gives us in this litigation scene with its two low-type characters.

"The Dinner Party"

On one canvas in particular Horace laid a heavy brush with brilliant colors. The description of the dinner party given by Nasidienus which makes up the whole of the eighth satire of Book 2 shows, no doubt, the character of this vulgar and ostentatious gourmand, but the picture that stays longest with us is that of the meal itself. Caecuban and Chian wine, skirret, fish-pickle, leeks, turnips, lettuces, radishes, cheese-cakes, fowl, oysters, plaice and turbot livers, lamprey, shrimps, sauce, crane, goose liver, hares' limbs, blackbirds, rumpless pigeons—these are the dishes that Fundanius, one of the guests at the dinner, describes for us with much relish.

From another place (Sat. 2.6.72-76) we know what topics of conversation Horace regarded as suitable for well-bred gentlemen at a dinner party, elaborate or simple. But here we are admitted to a dinner at which the host's whole preoccupation is with the food which he describes to his guests through the entire meal with "the curious and affected erudition of pronounced epicures."² Lest the reported detailing of the food preparations become too tiresome, Horace skillfully weaves in an episode in which an overhanging canopy falls down on the diners to the great embarrassment of the host and the great delight of the guests. The episode is amusing in its own right; considered in its relation to the whole, it offers further evidence that we are dealing not only with a good story-teller, but with a master-craftsman.

If Horace devotes whole poems to his "Boor," his "Litigants," and the "Dinner Party," there are other times when his picture is just a small part of a greater whole. But even then we find that in only a few words this poet has given us

a picture that long remains with us. Think, if you will, of the lazy boatman of the "Journey to Brundisium." In nine lines (*Sat.* 1.5.15-23) we are shown a happy-go-lucky fellow who soaks himself in sour wine, grows expansively melodious in song, and finally, presumably because of his drinking, yields to sleep though it was really his job to keep the craft moving on the water. A mere episode in the whole journey, but a vivid picture!

Type Characters

So far we have seen Horace at work as he draws definite individuals, fictitious though they may be. Worth noting, too, however, are the pictures he can paint of a type or kind of person. Thus when he wishes to remind us that our lives can be filled with inconsistencies, he does so by presenting the inconsistencies of the musician Tigellius (*Sat.* 1.3.3-19). Tigellius, we are told, will never sing if asked, but will unbidden sometimes break into song that is continuous for the whole meal; at times he runs, at times walks as if he were in a sacred procession; now he will keep two hundred slaves, again it will be only ten; one day his speech will be of kings and grandeur, another day he speaks of his own ever so moderate needs. But give this moderate fellow a million sesterces, and within a week his wild spending will leave him with empty pockets.

As one speaks a passage such as the opening of this satire, one feels that Horace's interest is not in the individual portrayed in the same way it was in "The Boor" or "The Litigants" or even such a minor figure as "The Boatman." Tigellius is not presented here for any delight we might draw in viewing him; we are meant to see him, but only so that we may immediately see beyond him. Any other example might have served just as well. It is the inconsistent man in whom we are interested and who is really sketched for us.

The first satire of Book 1 uses this same technique, but with a variation. We are to be shown the discontented man, so that Horace may lead into a discussion of the limited nature of man's real needs and may eventually expound his philosophy of the golden mean. To picture discontent for us, Horace this time does

not choose one individual, but a class of individuals, or rather four classes, whom he pairs off and places in envious tension, all claiming they would like to exchange lots with the other. Soldiers wish they could become merchants, merchants would—at least at times—gladly live the soldier's life; the lawyer from the town yearns for the peaceful life of the farmer, the farmer envies the life of the townsman.

Horace Himself

In the *Saturae*, there is one portrait that is to be had not from one passage or even one satire, but from a reading of the ensemble. That is the picture of Horace that gradually takes form and shape, and a rather attractive picture it is on the whole.³ In the sixth satire of Book 1 we see the young Horace at the time of his introduction to Maecenas. Almost lost for words, he just manages to stammer out a short, unpretentious autobiography to the famous man:

Ut veni coram, singultim pauca locutus,
Infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari,
Non ego me claro natum patre, non ego circum
Me Satureiano vectari rura caballo,
Sed quod eram narro (*Sat.* 1.6.56-60).

For nine months he hears no more from Maecenas, but after that time is summoned into his company and intimate friendship. It is to Maecenas' credit that he recognized genius even in the son of a lowly freedman; it is to Horace's credit that he fully appreciated the noble standards by which Maecenas arrived at his judgment:

Quod . . . magnum hoc ego duco,
Quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum
Non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro
(*Sat.* 1.6.62-64).

Horace is by no means a discontented man like the one he satirizes. If he preaches moderation, he lives by his preachment. Not only does he want little, but he finds that the gods have blessed him beyond his desires, and he is grateful:

Hoc erat in votis: modus agri non ita magnus,
Hortus ubi et tecto vicinus iugis aquae fons
Et paulum silvae super his foret. Auctius atque
Di melius fecere. Bene est (*Sat.* 2.6.1-4).

Humorously he can ask Mercury to grant him fat flocks, fat everything—except a fat head:

Pingue pecus domino facias et cetera praeter
Ingenium . . . (*Sat.* 2.6.14-15).

He likes good company, good food, and good conversation (*Sat.* 2.6.63-76). He relishes a homely tale (*Sat.* 2.6.77-78). But he is not a completely idle man, content to do nothing (*nequeo dormire*, *Sat.* 2.1.7). He is possessed by the urge to write—an urge that will be kept within the bounds of decency and will never take advantage of the living (*sed hic stilus haud petet ultro quemquam animantem*, *Sat.* 2.1.39-40).

Horace against Horace

Lastly, we may find our picture rounded out with a most admirable—we may even say lovable—characteristic. Horace can make himself as well as others the butt of his satire. In Book 2 he does this in both the third and seventh satires. In the first of these two, the longest of Horace's works save only the *Ars Poetica*, it is the bankrupt art dealer, Damasippus, who lectures Horace on philosophy and even accuses him of some of the follies of the crowd; in the seventh satire it is Horace's own slave who is granted permission to say whatever he will and toward whom Horace feigns an anger for his supposedly impudent criticisms of his master.

Only the magnanimous man—only the secure man—can tolerate the joke played on himself or encourage laughter at his own foibles. Horace was secure in the knowledge of his own worth, and for all the fact that he was a satirist and one who could on another occasion say *odi profanum vulgus* (*Carm.* 3.1.1), he was, we feel, essentially a lover of mankind.

We may say, then, that Horace's portraits are painted through a twofold technique: (1) through reported conversation in which a character emerges dramatically, and (2) through his own or someone else's descriptions. Furthermore, Horace is concerned to paint not only individuals in the concrete, but his interest goes also to types, such as the discontented man and the inconsistent man.

Writing in the days of the silent film, F. L. Hadsel called Horace "an artist who by the use of words secures effects far superior to any which the efforts of the silent drama of today can secure."⁴ It is perhaps dangerous to accept such a statement as wholly objective truth, but it is not hard to understand the love for Horace

that can prompt it. No doubt our greater debt in the case of the *Saturae* is to Horace the genial philosopher. But we must also acknowledge him as an artist with words, an artist who has left us some very vivid and engaging pictures that cannot but help us remember the philosophy they enshrine. To the artist no less than to the philosopher we stand in debt.

(The Reverend) David J. Dooley

Saint Louis University

NOTES

- 1 Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the 12th Century* (New York, Meridian Books, 1957) 109.
- 2 H. R. Fairclough, *Horace: Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica* (New York, Loeb Classical Library, 1926) 236.
- 3 One must not judge a pagan living before Christ by Christian standards, but rather take in stride such blemishes—from our point of view—on Horace's character as are revealed in the fifth satire of Book 1.
- 4 "Horace and the Modern Cinema Artist," *CW* 20 (1927) 147-149.

Breviora

Deaths among Classicists, II

Arthur Adams, of Boston, worker in English literature and history, and life member of the American Philological Association, died on June 21, 1960.

Sinclair MacLardy Adams, professor of Greek at Trinity College (Toronto) since 1941 and member of the American Philological Association since 1950, died on June 8, 1960.

Edith A. Beck, of Bradford, Massachusetts, life member of the American Philological Association, died on July 21, 1960.

Notable among young classicists who, though not professionally in the field, might have become productive scholars, was *Henry A. Dolan, Jr.*, graduate of Bowdoin College in 1939. A prize-winner there in Greek and Latin, he later became a Japanese interpreter for the American armed forces. His untimely death at forty-five years occurred at his home in Portland, Maine, on October 18, 1960.

The Reverend William Francis Dwyer, S.S., of Saint Charles College (Catonsville, Maryland) a member of the American Philological Association since 1950, died on March 10, 1960.

Ralph W. Harbinson, of Pittsburgh, a life member of the American Philological Association, died on December 12, 1959.

A graduate of the University of Chicago, notable for his extensive work in ancient classical drama, *Philip Whaley Harsh*, professor of classics at Stanford University since 1949, and appointed executive head of the department in 1953, died on August 14, 1960, at the age of fifty-five years.

Archaeologist and lecturer in the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University, *Karl Lehmann* died on January 21, 1961, at Basle (Switzerland), at the age of sixty-six years. Since 1938, under the auspices of New York University and in cooperation with the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, he had directed excavations at the sanctuary in the island of Samothrace.

Sir Richard Winn Livingston, president of Corpus Christi College (Oxford) from 1933 to 1950 and one of Britain's best known Greek scholars, died on December 26, 1960, at the age of eighty-three years. He was a frequent visiting lecturer in the United States; and his many honorary doctorates from institutions in the western hemisphere included those from Columbia, Toronto, and Yale.

Eugene Meyer, of Mount Kisco (New York), a life member of the American Philological Association, died on July 16, 1959.

Professor of history at Indiana University since 1935, *Prescott W. Townsend* died at Bloomington (Indiana) on January 4, 1961, at the age of sixty-seven years. He had taken the doctorate at Yale, and became known as a specialist in ancient history. On two occasions he spent a sabbatical year of study at the American Academy in Rome.

On the staff of the State University of Iowa since 1929 and emeritus professor of classical languages since 1952, *Dorrance Stinchfield White* died suddenly of a coronary occlusion in Iowa City on January 22, 1961, at the age of seventy-seven years. A past president of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South and well known among classicists, especially for his interest in the teaching of Latin, he had in 1957 celebrated a triple fiftieth anniversary—of his teaching, of his marriage (to Mabel Keist), and of his graduation from Bates College (Lewiston, Maine).

Mabel K. Whiteside, of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, where she was known for her work in the annual productions of Greek plays in Greek, a life member of the American Philological Association, died on March 1, 1960.

Editor's Note: For help in the compiling of these obituary notices, thanks are due to Mr. John P. Dolan (Iowa City, Iowa), and to Professors Herbert W. Benario (Emory University), Henry L. Levy (through his report of December 27, 1960, to the members of the American Philological Association), and Oscar E. Nybakken (State University of Iowa).

Meetings of Classical Interest, II

December 3, 1960: Winter Meeting of *The Classical Association of the Pacific States, Southern Section*, at the University of California (Los Angeles). Mrs. Sylvia Agulia (Marshall High School) is president of the Section, and Mrs. Louise Jones (Boron High School, Boron) is secretary-treasurer.

December, 1960: A newsletter from *The Classical Association of the Pacific States, Northern Section*, is headed by a message from the president, the Reverend Fred Reidy, S.J. There is a resume of the Forty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Section, held at the University of Washington on April 30, 1960, and an announcement that the next Annual Meeting would be held in the spring of 1961, the exact time and place to be indicated in the spring issue of the Section's *Bulletin*.

February 23-25, 1961: Annual Meeting of the *Illinois Classical Conference*, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago. President of the Conference is Cornelia M. Roberts (Grayslake Community High School); secretary-treasurer is Lucy Brokaw (The Latin School of Chicago). The Saturday meeting will be held jointly with the Chicago Classical Club (Ruby M. Hickman, president).

March 17-18, 1961: The Thirty-third National Convention of *Eta Sigma Phi Fraternity* will be held in Milwaukee, with Beta Sigma Chapter (Marquette University) serving as host, assisted by Beta Omicron (Mount Mary College) and Gamma Gamma (University

of Wisconsin—Milwaukee). National president of the Fraternity is Thomas P. Lordeon, undergraduate at Marshall College (Huntington, West Virginia), and national secretary is Dianne Haering, undergraduate at Mount Mary College. Professor H. R. Butts, Birmingham-Southern College (Birmingham, Alabama) is executive secretary.

April 6-8, 1961: The Fifty-seventh Annual Meeting of *The Classical Association of the Middle West and South* will be held at Cleveland, Ohio, with headquarters at the Pick-Carter Hotel. President of the Association is Professor John N. Hough (University of Colorado); secretary-treasurer is Professor Paul R. Murphy (Ohio University, at Athens).

April 27-29, 1961: Fourteenth *University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference*, at Lexington, on the theme "National Aspirations Woven on the Loom of Languages," according to announcement by Professor Jonah W. D. Skiles, director of the department of ancient languages at the University.

April 28-29, 1961: Annual Spring Meeting of *The Classical Association of the Atlantic States*, in New York City. Secretary-treasurer of the Association is Professor J. A. Maurer (Lehigh University, at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania).

Personalia Quaedam, II

Phillip Howard DeLacy, professor of classics and director of the department at Washington University (Saint Louis), resigned his post in January, 1961, to become director-designate of the department of classical languages at Northwestern University.

A Nobel Prize has been awarded to *Dr. Willard Frank Libby*, professor of chemistry at the Institute for Nuclear Studies and the department of chemistry (University of Chicago) since 1945, for his discovery of a method of dating organic matter by its radioactive carbon content. This discovery has been widely acclaimed among archaeologists as a means of approaching the dates of materials otherwise undatable and of checking upon dates already otherwise assigned.

John E. Rexine, professor of classics at Colgate University and a frequent contributor to THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN, delivered the baccalaureate address in June, 1960, at the Lowell (Massachusetts) State Teachers College.

William Hailey Willis, director of the department of classics at the University of Mississippi, is senior editor of the newly established journal *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, now in its third volume. The journal is concerned with the study and interpretation of the Greek tradition from the rise of ancient Mycenae to the fall of Constantinople.

Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies

A grant of \$5,000,000 by Old Dominion Foundation will make possible the fulfillment of plans for an inter-university world center in Washington, D. C., devoted to the study of the classical Greek tradition. The property and activities at the Center, to be named the Center for Hellenic Studies, will be administered by the Trustees for Harvard University, a District of Columbia corporation which is an arm or facility of Harvard University.

The grant, which represents the culmination of a long study by the Foundation and its consultants, will supply the necessary financial support for staffing the Center and for providing fellowship and publication assistance

to advance teaching and research concerned with classical Greek culture and the Hellenic tradition. The grant will also provide funds for the erection of a building to house the Center's activities. This building will stand on property, near Dumbarton Oaks, devised to Old Dominion Foundation for that purpose by the late Mrs. Truxton Beale in memory of her husband's son, Walker Blaine Beale.

In residence at the Center will be a small number of younger classical scholars, chosen by a group of Senior Fellows drawn from the faculties of leading universities. While the Senior Fellows will continue to discharge their regular duties at their respective universities, they will meet frequently with the Juniors and will in essence constitute a senior faculty of the Center. The Center is not envisaged as a large one; there are expected to be about six to eight Junior Fellows, and a somewhat smaller number of Seniors. In addition to the resident Junior Fellows and the non-resident Senior Fellows there will be a resident Director of the Center and, from time to time, one or two resident senior scholars on annual appointment to share with the Senior Fellows their function as a faculty of the Center.

Announcement of the plan and the grant was made jointly by Paul Mellon, Chairman of the Trustees of Old Dominion Foundation, and by Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University. Old Dominion Foundation, which was established by Mr. Mellon in 1941, has as one of its main interests the promotion of the humanities and liberal education. The Trustees for Harvard University manage the affairs of Dumbarton Oaks, with its research library and collection devoted to Mediaeval and Byzantine art and culture, which is located near the site of the new Center for Hellenic Studies.

The Trustees for Harvard University have appointed a small group of Senior Fellows who will devote part time to directing the program of the Center, choosing the younger scholars for fellowships, and setting up the Center's program of publication and related activities. The Trustees have also appointed a small Administrative Committee of scholars and laymen to oversee the effort.

During the period of organization, President Pusey will serve as chairman of the board of Senior Fellows and of the Administrative Committee of the Center for Hellenic Studies. The following Senior Fellows have been appointed: Professor John H. Finley of Harvard University; Professor Bernard Knox of Yale University; Professor Richmond Lattimore of Bryn Mawr College; Professor Whitney Oates of Princeton University; and Professor James H. Oliver of The Johns Hopkins University.

In addition to Mr. Pusey, the Administrative Committee will be composed of Ernest Brooks, Jr., of New York; David K. E. Bruce of Washington; Huntington Cairns of Washington; J. P. Elder of Cambridge, Massachusetts; R. Keith Kane of New York; Paul Mellon of Washington; Adolph W. Schmidt of Pittsburgh; and Stoddard M. Stevens of New York.

The group of Junior Fellows will be small and as currently planned will number about six young, distinguished post-doctoral scholars who are in the process of preparing studies on humanistic subjects related to Hellenism or perhaps occasionally including one or two younger men completing their doctoral dissertations. Normally the term of a fellowship will be for one year, but with the possibility of renewal for a second year.

The periodic meetings of this small group of Senior and Junior Fellows are considered one of the most important features of the Center. Thus the Center is expected to become a group of older and younger scholars held together by a common interest in Hellenism, the great cultural achievement of ancient Greece which

Book Review

Jean Smith and Arnold Toynbee (editors), *Gilbert Murray, An Unfinished Autobiography*. London, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1960; distributed in New York, by Oxford University Press. Pp. 225; pl. 4. \$4.00.

Gilbert Murray's personal memoirs, supplemented by essays written by seven of his associates, give a well-rounded and complete picture of his personality with its multiplicity and diversity of facets. The section that Murray himself wrote deals mainly with his early life in Australia and portrays his background and parental influences more completely than it depicts his own character and thought, though naturally his own genius—vivid, analytical, and humorous—shows through the characterization of his father and brothers. When he was eleven years old, his father's death caused the family to return to England, where his education was continued to its conclusion. Jean Smith completes the chronicle of his life, based, in large measure, on his letters in the second portion of the book.

His formal studies finished, he began teaching at New College; but after only one year he took the chair in Greek at Glasgow University, where the rigors of Scottish educational policy did much to mature his own thought processes and to mold his style to clarity and precision. However, it is his career at Oxford that was longest and most rewarding in the world of letters. This section of the book is contributed by Isabel Henderson.

His work for the theater and his efforts to raise the standards of its current offerings are discussed by Sybil Thorndike in collaboration with Lewis Casson, both of whom appeared in many of the theatrical productions and worked closely with Murray. It is in this phase of his creativeness that Murray was associated with George Bernard Shaw and Granville Barker.

His activities in the League of Nations, discussed here by Salvador de Madariaga, served to develop his international outlook on life, though the presence of so many "foreigners" gave him a slight initial shock. His insular concepts, however, broadened rapidly, and this work, together with his activities for the Committee for Intellectual Cooperation, contributed much to widen his horizons to global proportions. His own papers on the work of this Committee appear in the book, prepared by Jean Smith.

Bertrand Russell offers an appreciation of Murray, based on an association of fifty-six years' duration. To him, Murray's love of fantasy was his most appealing quality, and many of his delightful whimsies remained with Russell long after Murray himself had forgotten them.

Arnold Toynbee, who wrote the foreword, fittingly draws the work to a close. He brings into focus the many-sidedness of Murray's interests and activities, and points out that his identification of both the Hellenic genius and the modern Western genius with the liberal

through the centuries has notably influenced the history and tradition of the Mediterranean area, western Europe, and the Western hemisphere.

The aim of Mrs. Beale's gift to Old Dominion Foundation was "to rediscover the humanism of the Hellenic Greeks." In making its grant, Old Dominion's purpose has been to carry out Mrs. Beale's wish in the broadest way possible, so that the Center may emphasize humane values in American national life, organize and supervise humanistic research, conduct cooperative projects with related institutions both here and abroad, and encourage public awareness of the Greek tradition.

J. P. Elder

Harvard University

spirit gave unity to all Murray's pursuits and inspiration to each of them.

Gilbert Murray's contacts with many of his great contemporaries and his own eminence as a Greek scholar and leader of our cultural life make his "unfinished autobiography" an interesting commentary on the period covered by his life span of ninety-one years. It reveals to us, sharply etched, the personality of a man who was truly outstanding even among the great.

Sister M. Renelle Ojeman, S.S.N.D.

Notre Dame College,
Saint Louis, Missouri

SLIDES from THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN

"Something to Talk About"

—THE PARTHENON AT ATHENS

*By the Reverend M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.,
of The Creighton University*

Twenty-six colored slides taken with a Leica Camera with five different lenses to bring out the setting and details of the temple. Complete with a ten-page description of the temple and of the individual slides.

Descriptions of the individual shots:

1. Acropolis from Lycabettus
2. Acropolis from Pnyx
3. Acropolis from Museum Hill
4. Odeum, Stoa, and Parthenon
5. Drums in Wall of Acropolis
6. Erechtheum and Parthenon
7. Parthenon from NW
8. Parthenon from NNW
9. Parthenon from NW Corner
10. Parthenon from West
11. Capitals on NW Corner
12. NW Corner of Entablature
13. Portion of West Pediment
14. Column at SW Corner
15. Frieze from West
16. Detail from Frieze
17. Southern Pteroma
18. Curve of Stereobate on South
19. Curve of Stereobate on West
20. Entasis of Column
21. Incline of Columns on North
22. East Front of Parthenon
23. South Corner of East Pediment
24. North Corner of East Pediment
25. Interior of Parthenon
26. Parthenon at Night

Individual Slides \$0.50

Description of Temple \$0.20

Complete Set of Twenty-six \$7.50

(Price Includes Description)

Order from:

THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN
221 North Grand Boulevard
Saint Louis 3, Missouri

or:

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
The Creighton University
Omaha 31, Nebraska

Materials Available through the Office of The Classical Bulletin

Richard E. Arnold, S.J., Editor

CLASSICAL ESSAYS PRESENTED

TO JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

Containing an INTRODUCTION by the Editor, with articles by Walter R. Agard, William H. Alexander, Norman J. DeWitt, Charles C. Mierow, Clyde Murley, John A. Scott, Francis A. Sullivan, S.J.
Each, \$2.50

Thomas P. Byrne, S.J.

FACETE DICTUM: A LATIN READER WITH A DASH OF HUMOR

Light-hearted reading for those with a year and a half or more of systematic training in Latin.
Each, \$1.00

General Index

TO VOLUMES 1-25 OF THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN (1924-1949)

Each, 50c

William R. Hennes, S.J., and Richard E. Arnold, S.J.

IRIS: A READING LIST OF ARTICLES

SELECTED FROM CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

Chosen from nine periodicals from the beginning of each until August 1, 1941.
Each, \$1.50

Leo M. Kaiser

T. MACCIUS PLAUTUS, THE CAPTIVES: EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND VOCABULARY

Intended for rapid reading in lower classes.

Each, \$1.25

William C. Korfmacher

OTHLONI LIBELLUS PROVERBIORUM

Critical and annotated edition of an eleventh-century proverb collection.
Each, \$2.00

O. J. Kuhnmuellen, S.J.

AIDS FOR THE RHYTHMIC READING OF VERGIL

SOME AIDS TO LATIN

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Lillian B. Lawler, Dorothy M. Robathan, and

William C. Korfmacher, Editors

STUDES IN HONOR OF ULLMAN

A Festschrift in honor of Ullman's seventy-fifth birthday (1957). Each, \$4.00

(To Members of ACL, AIA, APA, CAAS, CAMWS, CANE, CAPS, on request, \$3.40)

Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.

CLASSICAL BOOKS FOR HIGH SCHOOL NEEDS

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Sense-Line Texts . . .

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO PRIMA (Peterson)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO TERTIA (Bachhuber)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO QUARTA (Giunta)

Cicero, PRO ARCHIA (Peterson)

Each, 25c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 20c

Address:

THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN

221 North Grand Boulevard
Saint Louis 3, Missouri

All items are sent plus postage

of
n

ith
er,
de
E.J.
50

A

nd
in.
00

60c

S.J.

LS
ing
50

25

nth-
.00

, 4c

ifth

WS,

, 4c

20c